

In order to adequately determine the merits of the claims presented in this continuation, a brief review of the applicants' invention is necessary. The applicants' invention utilizes a method whereby a client communicates with a host, and subsequently communicates with a server to decipher instructions given to the client by the host. In practice the client initiates contact with the host by establishing a datalink with the host, the client then provides information and requests instructions. The host provides coded instructions via datalink to the client which the client cannot decode by itself. The client then establishes a separate and independent datalink with a server which is in no way attached to the host. Coded information is transferred by the client to the server. The server decodes and sends uncoded instructions back to the client that the client converts into a specific graphical user interface (GUI) interface.

Newly added claims 8-10 are described at pages 4-8 of applicants' originally submitted application. Independent claim 8 specifically discloses that a table of screen recognition information is downloaded to the terminal, where it is used to decode screen identification information. It also discloses the process of receiving, decoding and sending screen information in general. As the applicant has stated in its previous office action response, the receiving, decoding and sending of screen information is not taught in the prior art. Neither are the specific steps using a table of screen recognition information disclosed in the prior art.

The use of a dedicated server by the client for the sole purpose of determining which data code has been received, decoding that data code, and supplying the screen identification information to the client is unique and specific only to this applicants' invention. The method described in claim 8 of this application is very specific, it describes a method by which a client terminal communicates with a host, the host sends coded instructions down a data line back to the client, the client then communicates with a sever sending coded information to the server that is then processed and returned to the client by the server. The order in which each unit is

activated is important because it is integral to the method. For each element involved, the client, the server, and the host, the sequence of activation as noted by claim 8 helps to illustrate the unobviousness of the invention and is clearly not anticipated by any prior art.

It is basic that the claims define the scope of the invention and "every portion of the ...claims must be considered in determining the invention as a whole in arriving at ... [a] decision as to obviousness required by . . . section 103", In re Duva, 156 USPQ 90, 94 (CCPA, 1967); and it is also basic that interpretation of the claims must be made " in the light of the . . . specification", Ex parte Tieman, 157 USPQ 158 (Dd. Of Appeals, 1967). In this connection, it is improper for the Office to invoke the knowledge of one skilled in the art to interpret and combine references as a basis for rejection but ignore that knowledge when establishing the context for the inventive concept of the disclosure and when interpreting the claims. It should also be noted that, "the teachings of the prior art would of themselves, and without the benefit of appellants' disclosure, suggest that which the applicant has taught", In re Leonor, 158 USPQ 20 (CCPA, 1968). See also In re Mergner, 158 USPQ 324 (CCPA, 1968) wherein the court stated that they should be "[m]indful of the admonition of the Supreme Court to avoid an evaluation of obviousness or nonobviousness of an invention by using hindsight".

Applicant has carefully studied the references as those references apply to the claimed subject matter of claim 8 keeping in mind the foregoing decisions, and believes that reconsideration in light of this amendment is proper.

Claims 9 and 10 are dependent upon claim 8, and are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons set forth therein.

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that there are further issues preventing the case from passing to allowance, he is requested to telephone if at all possible.

[illegible]

KAPLAN & GILMAN, L.L.P.
900 Route 9 North, 5th Floor
Woodbridge, NJ 07095
Telephone (732) 634-7634
Facsimile (732) 634-6887

Jeffrey I. Kaplan, Esq.
Reg. No. 34,356